

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 19, 21, 22, 36 and 57 have been amended, claim 20 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1-6, 19, 21-23, and 36-40, 57-62 and 75 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 19-23, 36, 37, 40, 57, 58, 61, 62 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Tanoue et al. (U.S. Patent 6,657,937). Claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and the elements of claim 20 have been incorporated into claims 1, 19, 36, and 57. The rejection of claim 20 is thus moot. The applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

Tanoue discloses a method and apparatus to minimize the effect of defective pits when recording an optical disc, such as a DVD (abstract; col. 3, lines 19-21). Tanoue discloses a disc with several sectors (col. 4, lines 19-20). Each sector has a header field and a recording field (FIG. 4; col. 4, lines 63-64, col. 5, lines 66-67). The header field includes an address mark to detect boundaries between blocks (col. 5, lines 31-32). The header field also includes PID fields and PA fields containing identification information (col. 5, line 7) and information used in demodulating data stored in the block (col. 5, lines 61-62). In addition to user data, the recording field also includes a PA3 field, a guard field, and a buffer to minimize degradation and overlapping (col. 6, lines 24-35).

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites an information storage medium in which data is recorded in recording units, each of the recording units comprising a body including user data and a first recognizer; and a head which is arranged in front of the body and includes a second recognizer other than the first recognizer that is unique such that the second recognizer cannot be detected from any other patterns in the body, wherein a number of maximum length patterns used to form the second recognizer is greater than a number of maximum length patterns used to form the first recognizer so that the second recognizer is distinguished from the first recognizer, and the second recognizer is disposed in a rear part of the head and comprises a head closing mark, which marks a closing of the head.

Tenoue does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1. For example, Tenoue fails to disclose that the head identifying pattern is disposed in a rear part of the head and comprises a head closing mark, which marks a closing of the head. The Examiner construes the head identifying pattern as corresponding to the 'PID1' field. However, the 'PID1' field is not located in a rear part of the head and thus cannot mark a closing of the head. Similarly, the 'PA1' field is also not located in the rear part of the head. Further, the 'PA1' field does not include a mark that marks a closing of the head. Although the 'PA3' field is located at the end of the head field, as shown in FIG. 4 of Tenoue, the 'PA3' field does not include a head identifying pattern as recited by claim 1. Neither the 'PID1' field nor the 'PA1' field are disposed in a rear part of the head, nor do these fields include a head closing mark. Tenoue therefore does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As to claim 2, claim 2 depends from claim 1. The rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. In addition, Tenoue fails to disclose a tail arranged behind the body as recited in claim 2. The elements disclosed by Tenoue that the Examiner construes as corresponding to the tail (the post amble PA3, guard 2, and buffer field) are disclosed as part of the body, not as part of a tail arranged behind the body. FIG. 3 clearly discloses that these elements are part of the recording field, not part of a separate tail.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 5 and 6 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

As to claim 19, claim 19 contains language similar to claim 1. The rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 21-23 depend on claim 19. The rejections of claims 21-23 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 19. In addition, claim 22 contains language similar to claim 2 above, and the rejection should be withdrawn for the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

As to claim 36, claim 36 contains language similar to claim 1. The rejection of claim 36 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 37 and 40 depend from claim 36. The rejections of claims 37-40 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 36. In addition, claim 37 contains language similar to claim 2 above, and the rejection of claim 37 should be withdrawn for the

additional reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

As to claim 57, claim 57 contains language similar to claim 1. The rejection of claim 57 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 57.

Claims 58, 61, 62, and 75 depend from claim 57. The rejection of claims 58, 61, 62, and 75 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 57. In addition, claim 58 contains language similar to claim 2. The rejection of claim 58 should be withdrawn for the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 2.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 3, 4, 38, 39, 59, and 60 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As the base claims from which these claims depend are now deemed patentable, the objections to these claims should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/26/07

By: 
Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510